

**REMARKS**

The Advisory Action of December 22, 2005, and the final Office Action of October 3, 2005, have been received and reviewed.

Claims 1-52 are currently pending in the above-referenced application. Claims 3, 11 and 13-53 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12, which have been considered, stand rejected. Claims 6 and 7 recite allowable subject matter, but have been objected to for depending from rejected base claims.

It is proposed that independent claims 1 and 23 be amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 5 and 6. It is also proposed that claims 5 and 6 be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single reference which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Kowase

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being drawn to subject matter that is allegedly anticipated by the subject matter disclosed in Japanese patent publication 63-232342 of Kowase (hereinafter "Kowase").

It is proposed that independent claim 1 be amended to include the limitations of claim 6, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of amended independent claim 1 is moot, as are the rejections of claims 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12 depending therefrom.

Akram

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being directed to subject matter that is assertedly anticipated by the disclosure of U.S. Patent 6,072,236 to Akram, et al. (hereinafter “Akram”).

It is proposed that independent claim 1 be amended to include the limitations of claim 6, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of amended independent claim 1 is moot, as are the rejections of claims 2, 4, 5, 8-10, and 12 depending therefrom.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The indication that claims 6 and 7 are drawn to allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. The limitations of claim 6 (and claim 5, from which claim 6 directly depends) have been incorporated into independent claim 1.

**Election of Species Requirement**

It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 remains generic to all of the species of invention that were identified in the Election of Species Requirement in the above-referenced application. In view of the allowability of these claims, claims 3, 11, and 13-52, which have been withdrawn from consideration, should also be considered and allowed. M.P.E.P. § 806.04(d).

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1-52 is allowable. An early notice of the allowability of each of these claims is respectfully solicited, as is an indication that the above-referenced application has been passed for issuance. If any issues preventing allowance of the above-referenced application remain which might be resolved by way of a telephone conference, the Office is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brick G. Power", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Brick G. Power  
Registration No. 38,581  
Attorney for Applicants  
TRASKBRITT, PC  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: January 3, 2006  
BGP/djp:eg  
Document in ProLaw